

thank the Examiner for allowing claim 6, and for indicating that claim 5 includes patentable subject matter.

For the record, Applicants note that the grounds of rejection incorrectly cite the Andersson et al. patent throughout the Office Action as 6,130,721. Applicants have discussed this discrepancy with the Examiner, and the Examiner has indicated that the correct number is 6,130,731. Applicants have proceeded with the remarks herein based on the '731 patent as discussed with the Examiner.

In the March 1, 2005 Amendment, entered by the April 1, 2005 Request for Continued Examination, claim 4 was amended to more clearly recite the quarter plate and half plate features of the present invention, as well as the placement of the display panel and the compensation panel with respect the polarization beam splitter and the mirror.

In this Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Wu et al. does not disclose that the display panel satisfies a quarter plate condition and the compensation panel satisfies a half plate condition. However, the Examiner uses newly cited Andersson et al. and argues that this reference discloses a device wherein a display panel satisfies a quarter plate condition and a compensation plate satisfies a half plate condition (citing Fig. 3B). Accordingly, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the display panel to satisfy a quarter plate condition and a compensation plate to satisfy a half plate condition since one would be motivated to produce "optimum wavelength characteristics" (citing col. 5, line 3). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Andersson et al. does not disclose a device in Figure 3B having a display panel and a compensation panel, both including liquid

crystal material. As shown in Figure 3B of Andersson et al., there is a SMFLC having a half-plate condition, and a birefringent quarter plate. One of ordinary skill in the art would not consider the quarter retarder plate (birefringent quarter plate) shown in Andersson et al. to be the same as the display panel (including liquid crystal material) recited by the present invention. As such, there would be no motivation to modify the Wu et al. device, particularly in view of the alignment of the cells 2 and 4 oriented 45° to the incident light polarization in the Wu et al. device.

Accordingly, in view of the five cited references combined not teaching the features of the present invention, Applicants respectfully submit that reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/682,423

Attorney Docket No. Q77871

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald Kimble
Registration No. 44,186

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 29, 2005